

Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the full committee, who has shown immense leadership in this issue and one that we have dealt with for a number of years.

I did not realize it was 1983 when the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) first introduced his legislation. But in the true spirit of the Committee on Commerce, we were able to craft a compromise that will truly change the satellite industry for the better based on competition, new technologies, and breaking up the last monopoly, as my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) said.

So my hat is off to the chairman on his efforts in this very important piece of legislation, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and Senator BURNS and others on the Senate side for bringing us to where we are tonight.

There were times when I did not think we were going to be successful in our efforts. Too many times this bill reached a Sisyphus proportions where we were perhaps doomed to roll that rock up the proverbial mountain and have it rolled back, as my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) reminds us so many times on some of these pieces of legislation.

But I guess if it was easy, we would have done it long ago. And so our hats are off to the chairman; and as he is a retiring Member, this will be perceived as one of his greatest triumphs for our committee and for the entire country and for this he is to be congratulated.

So I thank everyone involved with this.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank again the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for his cooperation and particularly thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) who labored on this long before I got really into the picture and has been invaluable in his help in moving us to this time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the efforts of Chairman BLILEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. OXLEY and our friends in the other body for reaching a consensus on legislation to promote more competition in the satellite communication industry. The conference agreement on S. 376 is landmark legislation that will finally update our nation's satellite communication laws for the 21st century.

I am pleased that the conference agreement is a bipartisan bill that will encourage the privatization of INTELSAT without imposing unreasonable restrictions or penalties that will hurt consumers. Of course, if INTELSAT thumbs its nose at the standards set forth in this bill for a pro-competitive privatization, its ability to offer services in the United States could be hindered dramatically. However, this

leverage is necessary to ensure that INTELSAT truly privatizes, and to ensure that we finally have a level playing field in the satellite services market.

I am also pleased that the conferees made several necessary changes to the conference agreement to ensure that the Department of Defense and other agencies that protect our national security would not be harmed by any limitations imposed upon INTELSAT if it were to fail to privatize in a timely manner. This bill is explicit in its protection of our national security interests, and I especially want to thank Mr. DINGELL, the Ranking Member of the Commerce Committee, for including this language in the bill.

It is also important to note that this bill eliminates several antiquated statutes that have hindered the growth and expansion of satellite communications companies. In particular, this bill will enable Lockheed Martin to complete its acquisition of COMSAT Corporation. I am confident that this merger will enhance competition in the satellite services market, and I urge the FCC to act on this merger as soon as possible. American companies like Lockheed Martin and COMSAT deserve the right to compete in the global satellite market now without any further delay.

I want to thank all of the members and staff who worked so hard on this important legislation. I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 376, the Communications Satellite Competition and Privatization Act, and commend House Commerce Chairman TOM BLILEY and Congressman EDWARD MARKEY for their work in crafting this important legislation. This bill is yet another feather in their cap—another important step in Congress's ongoing efforts to deregulate the telecommunications industry.

S. 376 will enhance competition and open foreign markets for U.S. companies by promoting the privatization of the intergovernmental satellite organizations—called Intelsat and Inmarsat—that dominate international commercial satellite communications. These organizations operate as a cartel-like structure comprised of the national telephone monopolies and dominant companies of its member organizations.

The provisions contained in S. 376—which will update policies dating back to 1962—are long overdue. I don't think anyone in this Congress needs to be told the extent to which communications technology has changed in the past 40 years.

Back in 1962, it was widely believed that only governments could finance and manage a global satellite system. Today, however, two companies in my own district—GE Americom and PanAmSat—are among the private companies that offer high-quality international services. These companies have launched private sector ventures that must compete with Intelsat, an intergovernmental behemoth.

Yet, we still have the same structure for international satellite communications that was designed before Neil Armstrong walked on the moon. The result is a distorted marketplace, stifled competition and innovation, and increased prices for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the promotion of a competitive satellite communications marketplace is a goal we should all support and I urge my colleagues to support this pro-trade, pro-consumer bill.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I

move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT ON FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Government Reform:

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), as amended (Public Law 92-463; 5 U.S.C., App. 2, 6(c)), I hereby submit the Twenty-seventh Annual Report on Federal Advisory Committees, covering fiscal year 1998.

In keeping with my commitment to create a more responsive government, the executive branch continues to implement my policy of maintaining the number of advisory committees within the ceiling of 534 required by Executive Order 12838 of February 10, 1993. Accordingly, the number of discretionary advisory committees (established under general congressional authorizations) was again held to substantially below that number. During fiscal year 1998, 460 discretionary committees advised executive branch officials. The number of discretionary committees supported represents a 43 percent reduction in the 801 in existence at the beginning of my Administration.

Through the planning process required by Executive Order 12838, the total number of advisory committees specifically mandated by statute also continues to decline. The 388 such groups supported at the end of fiscal year 1998 represents a modest decrease from the 391 in existence at the end of fiscal year 1997. However, compared to the 439 advisory committees mandated by statute at the beginning of my Administration, the net total for fiscal year 1998 reflects nearly a 12 percent decrease since 1993.

The executive branch has worked jointly with the Congress to establish a partnership whereby all advisory committees that are required by statute are regularly reviewed through the legislative reauthorization process and that any such new committees proposed through legislation are closely linked to compelling national interests. Furthermore, my Administration will continue to direct the estimated costs to fund required statutory groups in fiscal year 1999, or \$45.8 million, toward supporting initiatives that reflect the highest priority public involvement efforts.

Combined savings achieved through actions taken during fiscal year 1998 to eliminate all advisory committees that

are no longer needed, or that have completed their missions, totaled \$7.6 million. This reflects the termination of 47 committees, originally established under both congressional authorities or implemented by executive agency decisions. Agencies will continue to review and eliminate advisory committees that are obsolete, duplicative, or of a lesser priority than those that would serve a well-defined national interest. New committees will be established only when they are essential to the conduct of necessary business, are clearly in the public's best interests, and when they serve to enhance Federal decisionmaking through an open and collaborative process with the American people.

I urge the Congress to work closely with the General Services Administration and each department and agency to examine additional opportunities for strengthening the contributions made by Federal advisory committees.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 9, 2000.

RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE FROM MARCH 9, 2000 OR MARCH 10, 2000 UNTIL MARCH 20, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 94) providing for recess or adjournment of the Senate from March 9, 2000, or March 10, 2000, until March 20, 2000, or second day after Members are notified.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 94

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, March 9, 2000, or Friday, March 10, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, March 20, 2000, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate concurrent resolution is concurred in.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2000

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2000

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 13, 2000, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14 for morning-hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WOLF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

PROPOSED SALE OF ATTACK HELICOPTERS TO TURKEY WOULD DESTABILIZE REGION, THREATEN HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration is currently considering a \$4 billion sale of attack helicopters to the Republic of Turkey. I am here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to express my strong opposition to this proposal.

Providing these helicopters to Turkey will only serve to increase tensions and instability in a region of the world that is vital to U.S. interests and which is already plagued by conflicts and human rights violations.

Put very simply, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the Turkish Armed Forces will use this advanced American military technology to threaten its neighbors and abuse its own citizens.

Mr. Speaker, several organizations have called upon the Clinton administration to refuse an export license for the attack helicopters to the Turkish Army because Turkey has failed to

make progress on human rights benchmarks set by the administration in 1998 as a condition for approval of the export license.

Among those organizations working to block the export license is Amnesty International. Dr. William F. Schulz, Executive Director of Amnesty International USA, stated that, "Based on the State Department's own annual human rights report, Turkey fails to meet the human rights benchmarks."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the section on Turkey in the State Department's annual human rights report issued just a few weeks ago states that, "The security forces continue to torture, beat, and otherwise abuse persons regularly. Torture, beatings, and other abuses by security forces remained widespread, at times resulting in deaths. Security forces at times beat journalists."

Mr. Speaker, in a particularly relevant issue with regard to the helicopters, both the State Department and Amnesty International have reported the use of helicopters to attack Kurdish villages in Turkey and to transport troops to regions where they have tortured and killed civilians.

Do we really want to see American advanced technology used by Turkey to accomplish these operations against the Kurdish people with even more ruthless efficiency?

Mr. Speaker, this helicopter deal is also a danger to regional stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Caucasus.

Recently there has been a thawing in Greek-Turkish relations, a trend which we all welcome. The sale of these helicopters to Turkey has the potential to upset this recent progress in the relations between these neighbors. It could well be seen by Greece as a destabilizing step at a time when we are seeking renewed efforts to resolve the Cyprus conflict, an issue that the administration considers a major priority.

In terms of Turkey's legitimate defense needs, it was hard to see any justification for these advanced attack helicopters. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that Turkey is already overarmed.

The neighboring country that has suffered the most from the Turkish Government's aggressive militaristic and nationalistic posture is Armenia. In the years between 1915 and 1923, Turkey perpetrated genocide against the Armenian people resulting in 1.5 million innocent Armenian civilians being murdered.

In the year 2000, Turkey continues to maintain an illegal blockade of its border with Armenia, which has prevented the delivery of vitally needed supplies to Armenia. Even Turkish business people would like to see the opening of corridors of trade and transport with Armenia. Turkey has also backed Azerbaijan in the conflict over Nagorno Karabagh. Given this pattern of hostility, the people of Armenia have every reason to fear the acquisition of these helicopters by Turkey.